DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 897 RC 009 040

AUTHOR	Falk, William W.; Comfort, Allen
TITLE	Demographic Trends in Education in Louisiana.
INSTITUTION	Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	LAES-H-1780
PUB DATE	Feb 76
NOTE	34p.; For related document, see ED 011 205. Paper presented at the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists Meetings (Mobile, Alabama, February 1976)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Caucasians; Census Figures; *Educational Trends; Equal Education; *Migration Patterns; Negroes; *Population Trends; *Racial Differences; Rural Farm Residents; *Rural Urban Differences; Schools; Teachers; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*Louisiana; Rural Nonfarm Residents; Rural Urban Migration

ABSTRACT

Utilizing census data from 1950, 1960, and 1970 and school data from 1950-51, 1960-61, and 1973-74, the historical trends in Louisiana education were analyzed. Units of analysis included: (1) the State; (2) the most urban and most rural parishes (defined as 65% urban or rural at each point in time); and (3) whites and nonwhites within the State and within rural and urban parishes. Data were analyzed in terms of state population, school-age population (7 to 17 years of age), and all teachers in the public schools. Analysis revealed: (1) an increase in urban populations; (2) a tremendous decrease in the percentage of people classified "rural farm" and a comparable increase in the "rural nonfarm" classification; (3) a stabilization of the proportion of whites and nonwhites in rural and urban areas for the past two decades; (4) an increase in the number of urban parishes and a decrease in the number of rural parishes; (5) increases in total population (35.8%) and school-age populations (68.2%); (6) a decrease in rural parish-school-age population (from 40% to 15% between 1950 and 1970); (7) equalization of the percentages of whites and nonwhites attending school by 1960; (8) increases in the total number of teachers, the number of nonwhite teachers, and degreed teachers; (9) equalization of rural/urban, white/nonwhite, and experienced/nonexperienced teacher differences by 1973-74. (JC)

ED119897

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS IN EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA*

William W. Falk and Allen Comfort
Louisiana State University

RC009078

*Paper presented at the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists meetings, Mobile, Alabama, February, 1976. Development of this paper was sponsored by the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to LAES project H-1780, "The Role of Schools in Rural Development." Appreciation is expressed to Brenda Altazan and Beth Wroten for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS IN EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA

William W. Falk and Allen Comfort
Louisiana State University

Introduction

Historically, the status of education in Louisiana has been poor, especially when compared to other states. For example, in a national ranking of literacy rates, Louisiana was ranked 50th.[1] But in this report the focus is not on a comparative analysis of Louisiana with other states; rather, the central interest is on variation within the state itself. In particular, we wish to examine two groupings which are thought to be sharply different--rural and urban parishes and whites and nonwhites within those parishes.

This study is largely a replication of earlier work by Smith[2] and Smith and Bertrand.[3] Their studies dealt with trends and patterns in Louisiana education from 1936 to 1960. Our study will serve to update theirs and also remedy several small methodological problems. It is rural parishes that we are especially interested in since they most often lag behind more urban parishes in terms of average years of educational attainment, teacher salaries, etc.

Rationale of the Study

One primary factor served as the impetus for this study. For several decades there has been a seemingly irreversible trend in America - the migration from rural to urban areas. Thus those writing of rural areas often referred to their populace as those "left behind." With increasing urbanization has been a concomitant trend on the part of

researchers to largely ignore rural areas. Some have written about urban areas (and their attendant problems) as though there could be no others. This myopic focus has led us to have a wealth of information on urban phenomena, but a paucity of comparable information on rural phenomena.

As Beale has recently shown,[4] the longstanding trend of rural-to-urban migration seems to have reached a turning point. Not only has the trend abated but it has reversed. We may now speak of urban-to-rural migration. Rural areas are both retaining more of their indigenous population as well as attracting new residents. Additionally, we seem to have reached an historical juncture when food and fiber production are no longer to be taken for granted. Thus rural areas are more and more in the news, both as places to live and for their economic and sustenance functions. It seems reasonable to expect, then, that rural areas will be under increasing demand to provide high quality services for rural residents; if past history is any indication, education will be one of those services of which many people will have high expectations and demands.

Education in rural areas will, thus, be important for at least two reasons. First, since food and fiber production is becoming increasingly mechanized and technological, it will be necessary to provide educational experiences skills requisite to competing in what will become an evermore competitive and skillful agricultural-rural labor market. This labor market will be constituted by persons in both agricultural jobs (e.g., farmers, operators of farm equipment, etc.) and in jobs which are agriculturally-supportive as well as services to rural residents (e.g., agricultural banking and finance, soil science,

agricultural production, parks and recreation planning, etc.). Second, for many persons, the educational facilities available are a key consideration in the choosing of a residence.[5] Thus there is (and will likely continue to be) a kind of mutual "push-pull" dialectic in leaving urban-suburban areas for rural areas. There is at least the sense of escaping urban problems in a move to less troubled rural areas (both a push and pull factor) but at the same time there is a desire to have available certain services which are comparable in quality to those just vacated: in short, to not feel that one's children will be placed at a disadvantage later on due to poor educational facilities.

It seems that the time has come when more information must be generated on rural folk, rural institutions, and rural areas. With reversed migration streams and an increasingly technological agriculture, education in rural areas is likely to have high demands placed upon it. Using the U.S. Census and the Annual Report for the State Department of Education as data, it is possible to begin a systematic assessment of various factors related to education in the state of Louisiana. This is facilitated by a recent grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the purpose of such an assessment with an emphasis on rural education.[6]

Methods and Procedures

As stated earlier, this study builds on the work of Smith and Smith and Bertrand. Smith was among the early rural sociologists who examined education from a sociological perspective. His later work with Bertrand built on this framework and allowed for a historical

analysis of roughly a quarter century of change (1937-1961). As did Smith and Bertrand, this study has drawn heavily on the U.S. Census and the Annual Reports of the Louisiana State Department of Education.[7]

Whereas Smith and Bertrand used Smith's earlier work in 1937 as a benchmark and then used as comparative dates 1950 and 1960, the present study has used 1950, 1960, and 1970 (for school data, 1974). The year 1950 was a key one for Louisiana because it was the first year that a majority of the citizenry resided in urban areas. Following the lead of Smith and Bertrand, it was decided to dichotomize urban and rural parishes. While Smith and Bertrand chose to operationalize the "most urban" parishes as 65 percent urban or more and "most rural" parishes as 75 percent rural or more in 1950, we chose to use 65 percent in both cases since this would standardize our comparative framework. Additionally, while they used the same parishes at all three points in time based on the 1950 classification, our number of parishes varies. It was found that certain "most rural" parishes in 1950 were no longer 65 percent rural in 1960; in fact one parish (St. Bernard) went from the most rural category to the most urban category between 1950 and 1960 and was the third most urban parish in Louisiana in 1970. Thus our method has meant to reduce potential interpretation error caused by the inclusion of parishes at a point in time when they are not actually "most rural" or "most urban" as the case might be.

The report is organized so that summary data is first presented on the rural and urban population for 1950, 1960, and 1970, and data is also presented for these same time periods and parishes on the school-age

population (7-17 years old) and on the school-age population actually enrolled in school. Data is also presented on factors directly related to the schools in rural and urban parishes. More specifically, this data is on teacher training and teacher experience. In almost all cases data is presented by both residence and race. A final section of the report is included to discuss selected findings which seem of interest.

Population Trends in Louisiana: 1950-1970

State Population Trends

Since our goal was to examine education in an historical manner, data were aggregated from the 1950, 1960, and 1970 censuses. These data convey the dramatic population shifts which occurred within the state over a period of twenty years. The total population continually increased from 2,683,516 in 1950 to 3,257,002 in 1960 to 3,643,180 in 1970, Table 1. Between 1950 and 1970 the state's population increased by 959,664, a gain of 35.8 percent. The white populace grew at a rate of 41.5 percent (from 1,796,683 in 1950 to 2,541,498 in 1970) whereas the nonwhite populace grew at a rate of 24.0 percent (from 886,833 in 1950 to 1,099,808 in 1970).[8] The white-to-nonwhite ratio remained quite constant with whites being 67.0 percent of the total population in 1950, 67.9 percent in 1960 and 69.8 percent in 1970.

Rural-Urban Population Trends

In 1950, for the first time, the majority of Louisianians were classified as urban dwellers (54.8 percent), while the rural farm and rural nonfarm population constituted the remaining 45.2 percent.

Table 1.-Population Trends in Louisiana, 1950-1970, by Race, Residence, and Most Urban and Most Rural Parishes

Population Group	1950	1960	1970	Increase or Decrease 1950-1970 Number	Percent
TOTAL	2,683,516	3,257,022	3,643,180	959,664	35.8
Residence					
Urban	1,471,696	2,060,606	2,406,150	934,454	63.5
Rural-Farm	567,455	233,138	113,757	-453,698	-80.0
Rural-Nonfarm	644,365	963,278	1,118,627	474,262	73.6
Race					
Whites	1,796,683	2,211,954	2,541,498	744,815	41.5
Urban	1,022,931	1,415,619	1,666,021	643,090	62.9
Rural-Farm	332,608	141,739	85,190	-247,418	-74.4
Rural-Nonfarm	441,144	654,516	794,742	353,598	80.2
Nonwhites	886,833	1,045,068	1,099,808	212,975	24.0
Urban	448,765	644,907	745,446	296,681	66.1
Rural-Farm	234,847	91,399	28,567	-206,271	-87.8
Rural-Nonfarm	203,221	308,762	323,885	120,664	59.4
Most Urban Parishes	1,173,449	1,678,814	1,928,480	755,031	64.3
Urban	1,045,421	1,482,560	1,723,795	678,374	64.9
Rural-Farm	35,186	16,100	7,856	-27,330	-77.7
Rural-Nonfarm	92,842	180,154	196,829	103,987	112.0
Most Rural Parishes	907,427	636,854	522,721	-384,706	-42.4
Urban	155,778	125,912	105,034	-50,755	-32.6
Rural-Farm	376,232	104,546	44,054	-332,178	-88.3
Rural-Nonfarm	375,417	406,396	373,633	-1,784	-0.5

By 1960 the urban population had increased to become 63.3 percent of the state population while the rural population had decreased to 36.7 percent. Again an increase was noted for the urban population in 1970 (to 66.1 percent) with another decrease in the rural population (to 33.9 percent). Between 1950 and 1970, the urban population increased from 1,471,696 persons to 2,406,150 persons - a growth rate of 63.5 percent. The rural population, on the other hand, was barely remaining constant with a slight increase from 1,211,820 in 1950 to 1,233,384 in 1970. It is especially interesting to note that between 1950 and 1970 rural farms decreased by nearly half a million people (453,698 or 80 percent) while the rural nonfarm was increasing by nearly equal amount (474,262 or 73.6 percent). Whereas the rural farm population had been 21.2 percent of the total state population in 1950, this had dropped to only 3.1 percent in 1970 (an actual loss of 453,698 persons). But the rural nonfarm went from 24.0 percent of the total state population in 1950 to 30.7 percent in 1970. Furthermore, when we analyze the percentage that rural farm and rural nonfarm constitutes of the total rural classification, we find that rural farm was 46.8 percent in 1950, 19.5 percent in 1960 and 9.2 percent in 1970. In short, as a percent of total rural population it was decreasing while at the same three points in time the rural nonfarm population increased from 53.2 percent to 80.5 percent to 90.7 percent - a rather radical rearrangement of the residential classification of the rural population. Thus, in this time period, a consistently greater proportion of the state's population were classified as urban and rural nonfarm with rural farms diminished appreciably.

Table 2.—A Listing of the Most Urban Parishes in 1950, 1960 and 1970

1950		1960		1970	
Most Urban Parishes	Percent Urban	Most Urban Parishes	Percent Urban	Most Urban Parishes	Percent Urban
Orleans	100.0	Orleans	100.0	Orleans	99.7
Jefferson	88.8	Jefferson	94.1	Jefferson	95.8
East Baton Rouge	85.8	East Baton Rouge	85.1	St. Bernard	91.3
Caddo	75.6	Caddo	80.8	East Baton Rouge	86.9
Calcasieu	72.2	Ouachita	79.2	Caddo	85.5
Ouachita	65.4	Calcasieu	73.9	Ouachita	78.5
		Iberia	67.0	Calcasieu	74.8
N = 6		Bossier	66.0	Lafayette	71.6
		St. Bernard	66.0	St. Mary	65.2
		N = 9		N = 9	

Table 3.—A Listing of the Most Rural Parishes in 1950, 1960, and 1970

1950		1960		1970	
Most Rural Parishes	Percent Rural	Most Rural Parishes	Percent Rural	Most Rural Parishes	Percent Rural
Assumption	100.0	Assumption	100.0	Assumption	100.0
Bienville	100.0	Caldwell	100.0	Caldwell	100.0
Caldwell	100.0	Cameron	100.0	Cameron	100.0
Cameron	100.0	Catahoula	100.0	Grant	100.0
Catahoula	100.0	East Feliciana	100.0	LaSalle	100.0
Grant	100.0	Grant	100.0	Red River	100.0
LaSalle	100.0	LaSalle	100.0	St. Helena	100.0
Livingston	100.0	Red River	100.0	Tensas	100.0
Plaquemines	100.0	St. Helena	100.0	West Carroll	100.0
Red River	100.0	Tensas	100.0	West Feliciana	100.0
Sabine	100.0	West Carroll	100.0	Sabine	83.3
St. Helena	100.0	West Feliciana	100.0	Pointe Coupee	82.1
St. James	100.0	Bienville	84.8	Bienville	81.5
Tensas	100.0	Union	84.5	Livingston	81.5
Union	100.0	Franklin	83.0	Union	81.5
West Carroll	100.0	Sabine	83.0	Franklin	77.7
West Feliciana	100.0	Pointe Coupee	82.4	Catahoula	76.5
Richland	88.2	St. James	82.2	Avoyelles	73.7
Franklin	87.6	St. Charles	77.9	East Feliciana	73.4
Pointe Coupee	87.1	Livingston	77.8	St. Charles	72.8
St. Martin	82.5	DeSoto	75.9	De Soto	71.7
DeSoto	81.8	Jackson	75.7	Plaquemines	71.7
Ascension	81.5	Avoyelles	74.9	Richland	68.5
Jackson	79.9	Vernon	74.4	Jackson	68.2
Evangeline	79.0	Iberville	74.3	Ascension	68.0
Iberville	78.5	Richland	72.4	St. James	67.2
Avoyelles	78.2	Evangeline	67.0	Iberville	66.7
St. Bernard	76.2	Allen	66.7		
Vernon	75.4	Ascension	66.6		
Lafourche	75.0	St. Martin	66.4		
St. Charles	74.8	St. Tammany	66.1		
East Carroll	74.7	Plaquemines	65.5		

(Table 3 - to be continued)

(Table 3 - continued)

1950		1960		1970	
Most Rural Parishes	Percent Rural	Most Rural Parishes	Percent Rural	Most Rural Parishes	Percent Rural
St. Landry	74.7				
Natchitoches	74.0				
West Baton Rouge	73.6				
Concordia	73.3				
Tangipahoa	72.0				
Allen	70.3				
St. John	70.0				
Claiborne	68.9				
St. Tammany	68.2				
Beauregard	67.4				
N = 42		N = 32		N = 27	

When we compare the whites and nonwhites on the rural and urban dimensions, some differences are noted. In 1950, 56.9 percent of whites were classified as urban versus 50.6 percent of nonwhites - only slight differences from the 54.8 percent for the whole state. In 1960 the percent urban increased to 64.0 percent for whites and to 61.7 percent for nonwhites - for the state the percentage was 63.3. These percentages again increased so that by 1970 they were 65.6 percent for whites versus 67.8 percent for nonwhites - for the state it was 66.1 percent. For both whites and nonwhites there was increasing classification as urban although the growth rate between 1950 and 1970 was somewhat smaller for whites with 62.9 percent versus 66.1 percent for nonwhites.

As did Smith and Bertrand, we, too, dichotomized "most urban" and "most rural" parishes. Using our criterion of 65.0 percent or greater for either the rural or urban classification, the number of parishes included in the analysis varies at each point in time, Tables 2 and 3. Briefly, in 1950, six parishes were "most urban" - Caddo, Calcasieu, East Baton Rouge, Jefferson, Orleans, and Ouachita. In 1960, this increased to nine parishes - the prior ones plus Bossier, Iberia, and St. Bernard. In 1970 there were again nine parishes but the particular parishes changed - Bossier and Iberia dropped out and Lafayette and St. Mary were added. While the number of "most urban" parishes grew between 1950 and 1970, the number of "most rural" parishes got continuously smaller. In 1950, nearly two-thirds of all parishes in the state (i.e., forty-two of sixty-four) met the criterion of 65 percent rural; by 1960 this had decreased to thirty-two parishes and by 1970 had further decreased to number only twenty-seven.

It is clear that the most urban parishes have recently accounted for a very high percentage of the total state population. The six parishes included in 1950 were 43.7 of the state population; with nine parishes included this increased to 51.5 percent in 1960 and 52.9 percent in 1970. Although forty-two parishes were included in the most rural category in 1950, they accounted for only 28.0 percent of total state population and this decreased to 15.7 percent in 1960 (with 32 parishes) and 11.5 percent in 1970 (with 27 parishes). Between 1950 and 1970, the most urban parishes grew by 64.3 percent (755,031 people) while the most rural parishes decreased by 42.4 percent (384,706 people).

A final observation is in order on the percent of all urban and rural persons in the most urban or most rural parishes. In 1950, 71.0 percent of all people classified as urban lived in these most urban parishes; this changed to 72.0 percent in 1960 and 71.6 percent in 1970. Thus approximately 7 out of every 10 persons classified as urban in Louisiana lived in parishes which were at least 65 percent urban. For the rural population, 62.0 percent of all people classified as rural in 1950 lived in the most rural parishes while this changed to 42.7 percent in 1960 and 33.9 percent in 1970. Whereas six out of every 10 persons classified as rural in 1950 lived in a most rural parish, only 3 of 10 did so in 1970.

School-Age Population Trends

Again in keeping with Smith and Bertrand, we have operationalized "school-age" as being between the ages of 7-17, "the ages at which children and youths are most likely to be in school."[9] In 1950 there

were 524,545 school-age youths in Louisiana and this increased to 731,455 in 1960 and to 882,475 in 1970; this was an actual increase of 357,930 or 68.2 percent between 1950 and 1970 and a sharp divergence from the 35.8 percent growth for the state as a whole, Table 4. Whites constituted 62.7 percent of school-age youth in 1950, 63.7 percent in 1960, and 64.9 percent in 1970 with nonwhites being 37.3 percent, 36.3 percent, and 35.1 percent at each respective time period. Whites grew at a faster rate with a 74.3 percent increase (244,276 persons) versus 58.0 percent increase for nonwhites (113,654 persons).

The percent of school-age children in the most urban parishes continuously increased as a percent of total state school-age population while the reverse was true for the most rural parishes. Between 1950 and 1970 the most urban parishes had school-age population growth of 140.4 percent (265,185 persons) whereas the most rural parishes decreased by 37.2 percent (78,606 persons). For each year, the most urban school-age population as a percent of total state school-age population increased going from 36.0 percent in 1950 to 47.9 percent in 1960 to 51.1 percent in 1970, a point by which over half of all school-age children in the state lived in only nine parishes. The most rural parishes declined from 40.3 percent in 1950 to 21.6 percent in 1960 to only 15.0 percent in 1970.

It must be kept in mind that these are trends of most urban and most rural parishes and that the number of parishes varies by year. What we are reporting on is the most urban or most rural parishes at a given point in time. We are not comparing the same parishes at each point in time by either name or number; what is held constant is the criteria for

Table 4.-Changes in the Number of Persons 7-17 Years Old in Louisiana, 1950-1970, by Race and Most Urban and Most Rural Parishes

Population Group 7-17 Years Old	1950	1960	1970	Increase or Decrease 1950-1970	
				Number	Percent
TOTAL POPULATION	524,545	731,455	882,475	357,930	68.2
Whites	328,685	465,982	572,961	244,276	74.3
Nonwhites	195,860	263,926	309,514	113,654	58.0
Most Urban Parishes	188,895	350,619	454,080	265,185	140.4
Most Rural Parishes	211,265	157,639	132,659	-78,606	-37.2

inclusion in the analysis of being either at least 65 percent urban or rural at each point in time. Since we have already demonstrated a change in the general population composition of these parishes (Tables 1 and 4), we would expect an increase in the actual number of school age children in the most urban parishes and a decrease in the most rural. The significant finding here is that given that we know of the general changes between 1950 and 1970, we also now find that by 1970 the school age children in the most rural parishes account for only 15 percent of all school-age children in the state - a very sharp decline from the 40.3 percent who had resided in most rural parishes in 1950. And additionally, as previously noted, over half of all school-age children in the state live in just nine urban parishes by 1970.

Trend in School Attendance

Parallelling the increase in school-age population, there was also a large increase between 1950 and 1970 in the number of children enrolled in school - an actual increase of 363,324 or 77.0 percent, Table 5. The white population enrollment increased by 246,090, a gain of 81.9 percent; but nonwhite enrollment gained less markedly growing by 68.4 percent (actual gain of 117,234). When we examine white and nonwhite enrollment as proportions of total enrollment, we find that the percentages are remarkably stable between 1950 and 1970. White enrollment was 64 percent of total enrollment in 1950 and 1960 and 65 percent in 1970, while nonwhite enrollment was 36 percent for 1950 and 1960 and 35 percent in 1970.

In addition to the proportionate white-nonwhite enrollments, an equally interesting finding is the percentages of both groups that are

Table 5.-Changes in Number of Persons 7-17 Years Old Enrolled in School in Louisiana, 1950-1970, by Race and Most Urban and Most Rural Parishes

Population Group 7-17 Years of Age Enrolled in School	1950	1960	1970	Increase or Decrease 1950-1970	
				Number	Percent
Total Population Enrolled	471,810	688,336	835,134	363,324	77.0
Percent Enrolled	89.9	94.1	94.6		
White Pop. Enrolled	300,315	442,477	546,405	246,090	81.9
Percent Enrolled	91.4	94.9	95.4		
Nonwhite Pop. Enrolled	171,495	245,859	288,729	117,234	68.4
Percent Enrolled	87.6	93.1	93.3		
Number Enrolled, Most Urban Parishes	174,165	331,325	430,562	256,397	147.2
Percent Enrolled	92.2	94.5	94.8		
Number Enrolled, Most Rural Parishes	188,825	147,947	123,943	-64,882	-34.4
Percent Enrolled	89.4	93.9	93.4		

enrolled as a percent of either total white or nonwhite school age population. In 1950 white percent enrolled was 91.4 and it increased to 94.9 in 1960 and slightly increased again in 1970 to 95.4. For nonwhites only 87.6 percent were enrolled in 1950 but this increased sharply to 93.1 percent in 1960 and again, but very minimally, to 93.3 in 1970. Apparently by 1960 the white-nonwhite disparity, at least when assessed by percent enrolled, had largely diminished but not been completely eliminated.

When we compare the most urban and most rural categories, we also see some interesting trends. The most urban parishes grew progressively larger in both actual numbers of school-age children and as a percentage of school enrollment, while the reverse was true for most rural parishes. The most urban parishes gained by 256,397 persons, or 147.2 percent. But the most rural parishes decreased by 64,882, or 34.4 percent. Neither urban nor rural parishes were too different in terms of percent enrolled although the most urban parishes were consistently higher on this. What was especially interesting was the comparison of most urban and most rural parishes as a percent of total state enrollment. In 1950 the most urban parishes accounted for 36.9 percent, but this increased to 48.1 percent in 1960 and again to 51.6 percent in 1970. But for rural parishes the percentages went from a high of 40.0 in 1950 to 21.5 in 1960 with a further decrease in 1970 to 14.8. Whereas four of every ten enrolled school-age children lived in 65 percent (or greater) rural parishes in 1950 only about one and one-half of every ten did so in 1970. For urban parishes the growth proceeded to a point in 1970 where just over half of all enrolled school-age children lived in the nine most urban parishes.

Teachers in Louisiana Public Schools

Teacher Distribution

One would expect that the change in number of teachers would be approximately equal to the change in school-age population enrollment. But in point of fact, the growth in the number of teachers has exceeded that of school-age population. Between 1950 and 1970, school-age population enrollment increased by 77.0 percent, whereas the total number of teachers increased from 17,400 to 42,235 (in 1973-74), an increase of 24,835 or 142.7 percent, Table 6. Just as this was true in the aggregate data, we find a similar trend for whites and nonwhites. Whereas the white enrollment increased by 81.9 percent and nonwhite by 68.4 percent, the white teachers increased from 11,872 in 1950-51 to 27,975 in 1973-74, an increase of 135.6 percent. Nonwhite teachers increased from 5,528 in 1950-51 to 14,260 in 1973-74, an increase of 158.0 percent. Thus when we examine the growth rates for teachers in Louisiana public schools versus school enrollment, it is apparent that teachers have increased at a faster pace than the number of students.

The change already noted in the general population and school-age population as found in most urban and most rural parishes is also found in the distribution of teachers in Louisiana. In 1950-51, 43.9 percent of all teachers in the state were in the forty-two most rural parishes; whereas only 31.9 percent were in the most urban parishes. By 1960-61 this had reversed so that 43.2 percent were in most urban parishes versus only 24.4 in most rural. And in 1973-74, most urban had increased to 47.4 percent of all teachers versus 16.9 percent in most rural.

Table 6. Trend in Professional Training of Public School Teachers (and Principals) in Louisiana by Race and Most Urban and Most Rural Parishes, 1950-51, 1960-61, and 1973-74 Sessions

Residence and Race Group	1950-51 Session					1960-61 Session					1973-74 Session				
	Total # of Teachers	Teachers with Degrees				Total # of Teachers	Teachers with Degrees				Total # of Teachers	Teachers with Degrees			
		Bachelor's	Master's	Ph.D./ Ed.D	Total		Bachelor's	Master's	Ph.D./ Ed.D	Total		Bachelor's	Master's	Ph.D./ Ed.D.	Total
Louisiana	17,400	11,263	1,621	0	12,884	27,726	19,564	6,030	22	25,616	42,235	27,589	13,815	83	41,487
% w/Degrees	74.1					92.4					98.2				
White	11,872	7,708	1,411	0	9,119	18,036	11,676	4,539	21	16,236	27,975	18,139	9,173	74	27,386
% w/Degrees	76.8					90.0					97.9				
Nonwhite	5,528	3,555	210	0	3,765	9,690	7,888	1,491	1	9,380	14,260	9,450	4,642	9	14,101
% w/Degrees	68.1					96.8					98.9				
Most Urban Parishes	5,543	3,902	866	0	4,768	11,975	8,266	2,918	13	11,197	20,035	12,888	6,802	49	19,739
% w/Degrees	86.0					93.5					98.5				
White	3,723	2,469	699	0	3,168	7,664	4,949	2,012	12	6,973	12,754	8,159	4,334	41	12,534
% w/Degrees	85.1					91.0					98.3				
Nonwhite	1,820	1,433	167	0	1,600	4,311	3,317	906	1	4,224	7,281	4,729	2,468	8	7,205
% w/Degrees	87.9					98.0					99.0				
Most Rural Parishes	7,631	4,589	455	0	5,044	6,758	4,811	1,313	5	6,129	7,120	4,748	2,220	13	6,981
% w/Degrees	66.1					90.7					98.1				
White	5,176	3,226	433	0	3,659	4,343	2,739	1,076	5	3,820	4,610	3,058	1,419	13	4,490
% w/Degrees	70.7					88.0					97.4				
Nonwhite	2,455	1,363	22	0	1,385	2,415	2,072	237	0	2,309	2,510	1,690	801	0	2,491
% w/Degrees	56.4					95.6					99.2				

Teacher Training

It is also of interest to compare the percentages of most urban and most rural who have (a) a college degree and (b) a graduate degree, Table 6. In the first case, 74.1 percent of all public school teachers in Louisiana had a college-degree in 1950-51 but 86.0 percent of those in most urban parishes had a degree whereas only 66.1 percent did in most rural parishes. This differential had changed markedly by 1960-61 when 92.4 percent of all teachers had a degree while 93.5 percent of most urban did and 90.7 percent of most rural did. Almost total equality was achieved by 1973-74 when 98.2 percent of all teachers had a degree with 98.5 percent in most urban and 98.1 percent in most rural doing so.

When we examine the percentages of either urban or rural who have a graduate degree, the findings are somewhat different. From 1950-51 to 1973-74, the proportion of teachers in Louisiana who had a graduate degree (calculated on the basis of all teachers, including those without even an undergraduate degree) increased steadily from 9.3 percent to 21.8 percent to 32.9 percent. Teachers in most urban parishes were consistently (if only slightly) above these percentages - 15.6, 24.5, and 34.2 from 1950-51 to 1973-74. Rural teachers were consistently (if only slightly) below the state proportions - 6.0, 19.4, and 31.4 for the same time periods. It seems apparent, however, that the historical disparity had largely abated by 1973-74 with only a small rural-urban difference.

Comparisons may also be made between the distributions and training of white and nonwhite teachers. Between 1950-51 and 1973-74 the white/nonwhite distributions were very similar with white percentages going from

68.2 to 65.0. and 66.2 while nonwhite percentages were 31.8, 35.0, and 33.8. The white/nonwhite distributions were also similar in most urban and most rural parishes. The similarities soon fade, however, when we examine the training of the two groups - with a surprising advantage going to nonwhites. Between 1950-51 and 1973-74, the percentage of whites with degrees increased steadily from 76.8 to 90.0 to 97.9; for nonwhites the increase was more dramatic going from 68.1 to 96.8 to 98.9. In short, from 1950-51, to 1960-61, nonwhites increased by nearly thirty percent their members with college degrees; the increase was so great that a larger percentage of nonwhite teachers were degree holders than whites. Although of less magnitude, nonwhites also had more college graduates as teachers in 1973-74. As may be seen in Table 6, this historical difference is found in both the most urban and most rural categories, with an incredible increase in the nonwhite most rural category wherein a gain was observed of nearly forty percent between 1950-51 and 1960-61 (from 56.4 to 95.6).

Little differences are found in the relative percentages of whites and nonwhites with graduate degrees - at least by the 1973-74 school year, Table 7. Whites clearly had larger percentages with graduate degrees in 1950-51 and 1960-61 (11.9 versus 3.8 and 25.2 versus 15.4 for whites and nonwhites, respectively); but in 1973-74, the two groups were nearly equal - 33.1 percent for whites versus 32.6 percent for nonwhites. In addition, the whites and nonwhites when compared within the most urban and most rural categories were nearly equal by 1973-74. Of all white teachers in the most urban category, the percentages with graduate degrees increased from 18.8 to 26.4 to 34.3 between 1950-51 and 1973-74; for urban nonwhites the percentages started out at a low of 9.2,

Table 7. Trend in Professional Experience of Public School Teachers (and Principals) in Louisiana by Race and Most Urban Rural Parishes, 1950-51, 1960-61, and 1973-74 Session

Residence and Group	1950-1951 Session[a]				1960-61 Session[b]				1973-74 Session[c]			
	% of Teachers with 0-4 Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 5-9 Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 10-14 Years Experience	% of Teachers with 15 or More Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 0-4 Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 5-9 Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 10-14 Years Experience	% of Teachers with 15 or More Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 0-4 Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 5-9 Yrs. Experience	% of Teachers with 10-14 Years Experience	% of Teachers with 15 or More Yrs. Experience
Louisiana	20.3	18.9	16.1	44.7	22.6	20.8	15.1	41.4	29.5	22.9	16.5	31.2
White	18.1	17.3	16.9	47.7	21.3	18.9	14.8	45.0	34.2	23.2	14.7	27.9
Nonwhite	24.8	22.3	14.5	38.5	25.0	24.4	15.9	34.8	20.1	22.2	20.2	37.6
Most Urban Parishes	19.2	15.7	14.5	50.7	27.2	23.1	14.2	35.6	29.8	23.3	17.4	29.6
White	17.8	14.9	14.4	52.8	27.6	21.0	13.8	37.6	34.7	23.9	15.0	26.3
Nonwhite	21.9	17.3	14.6	46.3	26.3	26.8	14.8	32.1	21.1	22.1	21.4	35.4
Most Rural Parishes	22.0	20.4	16.9	40.7	17.8	18.0	16.1	48.1	29.3	22.4	15.8	32.6
White	18.8	18.0	18.1	45.1	15.0	15.5	15.5	53.9	35.4	22.2	14.0	28.5
Nonwhite	28.7	25.5	14.4	31.4	22.9	22.4	17.3	37.5	18.0	22.9	19.0	40.0

[a,b,c] Reading across for each year, the rows sum to 100 percent.

increased to 21.0, and most recently was 34.0. Over the same time period in the most recently was 34.0. Over the same time period in the most rural category, the percentages of white teachers went from 8.4 to 24.9 to 31.1 while for nonwhites the increases were from 0.9 to 9.8 to 31.9. Again, by 1973-74, the historical disparity between whites and nonwhites had largely diminished.

Teacher Experience

Another teacher-related variable is the years of experience. As may be seen in Table 7, this has been categorized by ranges of years. The discussion here concentrates on the two extremes - 0-4 years (which we may assume to be fairly new, inexperienced teachers) and 15 or more years (which we may assume to be somewhat older, more experienced teachers).

In 1950-51, for the state as a whole, there was a disproportionate number of teachers in the more experienced category (44.7 percent). By 1960-61 the percentages had changed slightly but the more experienced category still had a large percentage of the state's teachers (41.4 percent). But the distribution was much different in 1973-74 with the least experienced and most experienced categories being nearly equal (29.5 percent versus 31.2 percent).

When we compare whites and nonwhite we find some rather sharp differences. In 1950-51 whites has more teachers in the experienced category (47.7 percent for whites versus 38.5 for nonwhites) and fewer teachers in the less experienced category (18.1 percent for whites versus 24.8 for nonwhites). This had changed little by 1960-61 with white percentages in most and least experienced categories being 45.0 and 21.3

versus 34.8 and 25.0 for nonwhites. However, by 1973-74 this pattern had been reversed; whites had a larger percentage than nonwhites with less experience (34.2 versus 20.1) and a smaller percentage with more experience (27.9 versus 37.6).

The patterns noted in the aggregate state data were mirrored in the most urban and most rural parishes. In 1950-51, both urban and rural categories had large percentages in the most experienced column with the urban percentage being larger than the rural one (50.7 versus 40.7). This was reversed in 1960-61 when the rural percentage was higher than the urban one for most experienced (48.1 for rural versus 35.6 for urban). But in 1973-74, both urban and rural categories were nearly like the state as a whole with little difference between them.

Just as there were historical differences between whites and nonwhites in the total state data, so, too, were there differences between these groups in the urban and rural settings. In 1950-51 and 1960-61, the white and nonwhite difference in the most urban parishes were minimal; but in 1973-74, urban whites had for more persons in the least experienced category (34.7 percent for whites but only 21.1 percent for nonwhites) while the reverse was true in the most experienced category (26.3 for whites but 35.4 for nonwhites). A somewhat similar trend was found in the most rural parishes, although whites had far fewer persons in the least experienced category in 1950-51 and 1960-61 (18.8 percent and 15.0 percent versus 28.7 percent and 22.9 percent, for whites and nonwhites, respectively). At the same time, whites had larger percentages in the most experienced category (45.1 and 53.9 versus 31.4 and 37.5). Again, as in the urban case, the obverse of this was found in 1973-74 when

proportionately more whites were in the least experienced category (35.4 percent for whites, 18.0 percent for nonwhites) and proportionately fewer in the most experienced category (28.5 percent for whites versus 40.0 percent for nonwhites).

Summary and Conclusions

Using the earlier work of Smith and Smith and Bertrand as points of departure, this study has sought to analyze historical trends in education in Louisiana. In recent years rural areas have been given more and more visibility by the mass media and are no longer as taken-for-granted as they once were. With reverse migration streams now leading (back) to rural areas, there is - and will continue to be - greater pressure on rural areas to provide certain services comparable in quality to those in urban areas. One such service, in particular, is education.

The current study has used census data from 1950, 1960, and 1970 and school data from comparable years (1950-51, 1960-61, and 1973-74) to assess trends in Louisiana education. The units of analysis nave been the state, the most urban and most rural parishes - defined as sixty-five percent urban or rural at each point in time - and whites and nonwhites within the state and within the rural and urban parishes. Data was analyzed on the state population, school-age population - defined as those between 7-17 years of age - and all teachers in the public schools.

In analyzing the state population for the past quarter century, two trends stood out: first, continually greater proportions of people are living in urban areas and second, of those in rural areas, there has been a tremendous drop in the number and percentage of people

classified as rural farm but a tremendous increase in rural nonfarm. The proportion of whites and nonwhites in rural and urban areas are nearly equal and have been nearly equal (i.e., 65-70 percent white, 30-35 percent nonwhite) for at least the past two decades. The number of parishes that are mostly urban has increased from six to nine, between 1950 and 1970, while the number of mostly rural parishes has decreased from forty-two to twenty-seven.

While the total population increased by 35.8 percent between 1950 and 1970, the school-age population increased by 68.2 percent. The white and nonwhite proportions were a fairly steady 65 percent white, 35 percent nonwhite. The percentages of the school-age population in either most urban or most rural parishes changed radically between 1950 and 1970 with 40 percent of all school-age children in the most rural parishes in 1950 but only 15 percent in 1970; at the same time most urban percentages went from 36 percent to 51 percent. By 1970, then, over one-half of all school-age children in the state lived in the nine most urban parishes. This same thing was found in examining school attendance. The most urban parishes gained in actual numbers and as a percent of the state school-age population enrolled in schools. By 1960 the percentages of whites and nonwhites attending school were nearly equal, an increase for nonwhites.

Teachers increased at a faster rate than either the state population or more significantly the school-age population. Nonwhite teachers increased more than white teachers (158 percent to 135.6 percent). Whereas over 40 percent of all teachers had been in the most rural parishes in 1950, by 1970 over 45 percent were in the most urban parishes.

The percentages of teachers with college degrees went from 74 in 1950-51 to 98 in 1973-74. An initial white and nonwhite disparity had changed by 1973-74 so that proportionately more nonwhites had college degrees. Another equilization was that earlier (i.e., in 1950-51) rural-urban differences (with a higher percentage having degrees in urban parishes) were essentially gone by 1973-74. Additionally, an initial rural-urban difference in the percentage having a graduate degree had disappeared by 1973-74. Whites had a greater percentage with both undergraduate and graduate degrees early-on but the difference was little by the current measure.

A final bit of analysis assessed trends in teacher experience. By 1973-74 the trend in the state was toward a bimodal distribution - many with little experience (under four years) and many with much experience (over fifteen years). Although whites had greater percentages in the much experience category in 1950-51 and 1960-61 with smaller percentages in the less experience category, the reverse was true in 1973-74 with a greater percentage of nonwhites being more experienced. The percent of much experienced teachers was higher in the most urban parishes in 1950-51 but higher in the most rural parishes in 1960-61 and there was little rural-urban difference in 1973-74. Urban and rural whites had higher percentages with much experience in 1950-51 and 1960-61 but urban and rural nonwhites had the higher percentages in 1973-74.

Conclusion

It is clear that the general population shifts in Louisiana have been like those in many other states with a dominant trend being the

the increase in mostly urban parishes and the decrease in mostly rural ones. It is also apparent that Louisiana, too, has experienced the movement away from farming by many of those living in rural areas. And, yet, the future may see an increase in the rural population, albeit in nonfarming occupations.

The educational data presented in this paper demonstrate the trends in the white and nonwhite and rural and urban school-age population. Given their stability over time, little need be said except that it is obvious that the lower numbers of nonwhites in the schools seems largely an historical artifact; while there may be questions about the quality of the educational experience for nonwhites versus whites, there is little doubt that nonwhites are attending school in proportions nearly equal to those for whites.

Perhaps the most interesting findings of this study are those related to teachers. Two things in particular stand out. First, the data dramatically illustrate the "catching up" that has occurred for nonwhite teachers. Although starting out in 1950 with far fewer teachers holding either a bachelor's or graduate degree, by 1973-74 they had not only eradicated this deficit but were, in fact, ahead of their white counterparts. There is a temptation here to speculate as to why this may have happened. While the reasons are no doubt multifaceted, it seems safe to say that the past quarter century has seen a radical turning away from overt racial discrimination. Given HEW and OEO guidelines, nonwhites have had increasing opportunity for jobs in sectors of the labor market which were historically closed to them. Although teaching has historically

been an avenue of mobility open to nonwhites, it seems reasonable to suggest here that the increase in nonwhite teachers and the incredible improvement in their attaining college degrees is partially due to a reduction in racial discrimination and a concomitant perception of greater opportunity. In short, we are speculating that an occupation open to nonwhites in 1950 was perceived as - and in fact was - even more attainable by 1973-74. The reversal of a greater proportion of whites having college degrees seems to support this line of reasoning. It is not the result, we suggest, of nonwhites simply putting more stress on education. Structurally, the opportunities must exist for certain goals to be attained. Thus aspiring to and attaining a college degree is only part of the picture - and a requisite at that. The larger picture deals with being able to find a teaching position once a degree is obtained and it is here, in particular, that structural changes must occur. Recall that the percentage growth of nonwhite teachers was far greater than that for the nonwhite population or school-age population. Of course the "real reasons" (if they may be ascertained) are still subject to investigation.

The preceding discussion has dealt with one significant finding of this study - the growth of nonwhite teachers and their training. A second important finding, related to the first, deals with the white and nonwhite differentials in years of experience. By 1973-74, the historical trend of greater proportions of nonwhites being less experienced. Just as we suggested that nonwhites may have perceived more opportunity, thus greater numbers of them attained college degrees, it seems that they may also make a more lasting commitment to teaching

once in it. The persons in the 1973-74 cohort of greater than fifteen years of experience has been teaching since at least 1958-59. Historically, nonwhites have not had the freedom to move between professions so much as to move within a profession. For example, instead of leaving teaching for a comparable profession (vis-a-vis a "job", which may be perceived of as less status even though potentially greater income producing), nonwhites may have been more likely to stay in an already secure position - say move from teacher to principal. Again this is speculation, but keep in mind that the late 1960's and early 1970's were a time of turbulence in education and especially in Louisiana where school desegregation occurred full force around 1970. For whites this could have expedited leaving the profession. In any case, the data demonstrate the change in the distribution of those with varying years of experience; the reasons for this redistribution are still speculative.

The analysis reported in this paper is only part of a much larger body of work currently in progress. Hopefully, questions raised in this paper will be answered in later papers which will detail historical trends with data of one-year intervals - thus if a turning point occurred it may be detectable. The present paper has merely shown the decrease in children directly affected by rural education and certain parallels between the educational structures in rural and urban areas. While our emphasis here has been on what seemed the significance of white and nonwhite differentials, our larger goal remains the investigation of educational equity between rural and urban areas. And it is to that end that our future work will address itself.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

[1]This data is from Public Affairs Research Council, PAR Analysis, Educational Attainment in Louisiana, No. 188, February, 1973. Also reported was Louisiana's ranking of 41st in the median years of education completed by adults 25 years old or older (10.8 yrs.). Louisiana ranked 50th in the proportion of adults with no schooling (3.9%); 50th for the proportion of adults with 5 years or less of schooling - the "functionally illiterate" (13.1%); 41st in the proportion of adults who have finished high school (42.3%) - the criterion considered by many to be the minimum requirements for an adequate education in the 1970's; and 35th in the proportion of adults who have finished college (9.1%).

[2]Marion B. Smith, A Sociological Analysis of Rural Education In Louisiana, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1938.

[3]Marion B. Smith and Alvin L. Bertrand, Rural Education in Transition: A Study of Trends and Patterns in Louisiana, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No. 576, December 1963.

[4]Calvin Beale, "Rural Development: Population and Resettlement," Journal of Soil and Water Resources, January-February, 1974.

[5]Almost any text on housing will support this statement. For examples, see Glenn H. Beyer, Housing and Society. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965; Nelson N. Foote et al., Housing Choice and Housing Constraints. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; George Grier and Eunice Grier, Equality and Beyond. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966.

[6]Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station project H-1780, "The Role of Schools in Rural Development," W.W. Falk, principal investigator.

[7]Census data in this report is from the United States Census of Population, for the years 1950, 1960, and 1970, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

[8]School data in this report are from the State Department of Education of Louisiana, One Hundred Second Annual Report for the Session 1950-51; One Hundred Twelfth Annual Report for the Session 1960-61; and One Hundred Twenty-Fifth Annual Report for the Session 1973-74.

[9]The terms "white" and "nonwhite" are used to maintain the distinction used by Smith and Bertrand. Since much of the information for this study was gathered from tables listing data as white or Negro, it was necessary to find the proportion of the state's nonwhite population that is composed of Negroes. In 1950, Negroes made-up 99.5% of the total nonwhite population; in 1960, 99.4% and in 1970, 98.8%. With percentages this high it is acceptable to use the data for Negroes as the data for nonwhites. This will facilitate the ease with which a comparison can be made between our study and the study of Smith and Bertrand.

[10]Smith and Bertrand, p. 11. We realize that given current pedagogical practice that this is a very conservative estimate. It is necessary however to make our analysis comparable to that of Smith and Bertrand.